



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

account for the amount of the bid, at the instance and on behalf of the purchaser. *Hyatt v. Anderson* (1903),—Neb. — 96 N. W. Rep. 620.

The above situation is easily distinguishable from an agreement with a guardian to give effect to a private agreement to sell to the purchaser when he obtained the order of the court, which is void as opposed to public policy. See *Mack v. Brammer*, 28 Ohio St. 508; *Downey v. Peabody*, 56 Ga. 40; *Rome Land Co. v. Eastman*, 80 Ga. 683. In the present case nothing irregular has been done. The guardian simply obtained the obligation of H to bid at a regular sale. He being the highest bidder it was properly sold to him under order of the court. *Stuart v. Allen*, 16 Cal. 474, 76 Am. Dec. 551,

HUSBAND AND WIFE—DISTRIBUTION AND DESCENT—STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—A husband and his wife settled upon lands in Kansas. Two years later a disagreement arose and the wife returned to her former home in the east. Husband continued to live upon the homestead for some years with the children of a former marriage. He then sold the lands, the purchaser supposing him to be a single man. The husband dying intestate, the wife brings action of ejectment to recover undivided half interest in the land under section 2510 Gen. St. 1901 which provides "that the wife shall not be entitled to any interest under the provisions of this section in any land to which the husband has made a conveyance, when the wife at the time of the conveyance *is not or never has been* a resident of the state." *Held*, that the word "or" should read "and," thus holding that the wife who was at one time a resident of the state is entitled to the benefits of the act. *Kennedy v. Haskell, et al.* (1903)—Kan.—73 Pac. 913.

The reasons assigned by the four justices who sustain the majority opinion is that where the sense demands it or the intention is evident the words "or" and "and" may be used interchangeably. *Starr v. Flynn*, 62 Kan. 845, *Metropolitan Board of Works v. Stead*, L. R. 8 Q. B. Div. 447, *State v. Myers* 10 Ia. 448, *Rigoney v. Neiman*, 73 Pa. St. 330, *Blemer v. People*, 76 Ill. 265. Also that all the words of the statute should be given some meaning; that the intention of the legislature is shown not to limit the operation of the law to her present residence by the use of the words "never has been;" that the use of "and" includes those who ever have been residents of the state and gives some meaning to all the statute. *Small v. Small*, 56 Kan. 1, 42 Pac. Rep. 323, 30 L. R. A. 243, 54 Am. St. Rep. 581. The three justices who dissent urge with force that the use of "and" would render "is not" superfluous thereby violating the very rule the majority were anxious to avoid. SUTHERLAND ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION, Art. 239, p. 317, and Art. 252, p. 330. They claim that this construction will open the door for fraud allowing those who were never citizens of Kansas, except by design, to have preference over continuous residents; and that the legislature thought it better to exclude the non-resident wife than to defeat the innocent resident of his title honestly acquired. The element of uncertainty is also introduced as the wife might have obtained a divorce in another state, leaving the status of the parties in doubt and making the transfer of land more difficult. *Buffington v. Grosvenor*, 46 Kan. 730, 27 Pac. Rep. 137, 13 L. R. A. 282.

INJUNCTION—STRIKES—PICKETING.—The striking employes of the W. & A. Fletcher Co. allege that through their association they have employed certain persons to maintain a system of quiet picketing in the street near the works of the defendants; that the defendants by intimidations, threats, violence, arrests, etc. were interfering with the pickets of the complainants. This is a bill for an injunction to restrain such interference. *Held*, that the